

program for current and future retirees. Unfortunately, many of our political opponents are trying to turn Medicare, the Medicare crisis, into a political issue. They continue to distort the idea of protecting Medicare by scaring seniors with imagined Medicare cuts, even though, as everybody knows, the benefits go per beneficiary from \$4,800 to \$6,700.

I would just ask the Democratic leadership and the Democrats on the other side, please help us. Join up with us, roll up your sleeves, let us achieve both better care with more choices. Let us protect and strengthen Medicare.

#### DO NOT REPEAL MEDICARE, THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT WITH SENIORS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, elected officials should listen more and talk less. I listened today while my Republican colleagues talked about how they intend to save Medicare. What they did not say is how they reduce expected needs of Medicare \$270 billion over 7 years and still cut taxes \$245 billion. Cut taxes, cut Medicare. Does that balance out?

Medicare. There is an estimated \$44 billion in fraud and abuse in the Medicare system. Maybe we do have some agreement on both sides, and we can cut fraud and abuse and still provide for senior health care. However, it also appears that the new Republican majority is cutting personnel in the Health Care Financing Administration, the GAO, who investigate the fraud in Medicare. Furthermore, the account in the Labor-HHS appropriation bill is \$2 million below last year for finding fraud, waste, and abuse. We need to save Medicare by cutting the fraud, but only in Washington can a \$270 billion cut be said it is to save the program. We do not need to repeal the original contract with American seniors in 1965. Happy birthday—Medicare.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON MUST REALIZE THERE IS NO PEACE IN BOSNIA TO KEEP

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how many times will we have to watch President Clinton flip-flop on his Bosnian policy before we lift the arms embargo?

How many lives are we going to have to lose before common sense wins out?

The President is upholding an embargo on a country that no longer exists that will further involve the United

States and possibly our troops in a war that is not ours to fight. We do not need U.N. control, we need U.S. control.

We keep hearing that we cannot lift the embargo because President Clinton wants to do whatever he can to keep the peace. Mr. Speaker, when is he going to realize that there is no peace to keep?

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MEDICARE

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Medicare's 30th birthday, let us remember its genesis.

It was the people of this country who asked their government to enter into a partnership with them to provide security in their later years.

It was an idea supported by Presidents Truman, Kennedy, Johnson, and even Nixon.

It was an idea that worked and continues to work.

Not one of my constituents has ever written, called, or met with me asking me to gut Medicare, eliminate it, or slash its funding.

The Republicans seem to think that they can fool the citizens of this country into thinking that their massive cuts will somehow reform the system. Cuts, I might add, that are suspiciously similar to the amount of money needed for their tax break package.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a trust fund, not a slush fund. It is a program whose inception began with the American people and is still overwhelmingly supported by them.

Let us celebrate Medicare's 30th birthday, Mr. Speaker, not prepare for its funeral.

#### REPUBLICANS' PROPOSAL CONTAINS MORE, NOT LESS, SPENDING FOR MEDICARE

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this truly is an amazing 20 minutes, and surely must be very confusing to those people who are listening. Perhaps if we simplify this a little and do a little of the things that we might have done in the fourth grade, and use some repetition.

The average spending per Medicare beneficiary today is \$4,800. Under the Republican plan, Medicare spending per beneficiary in the year 2002 will be \$6,700. Under this plan, Medicare spending increases by \$1,900 per beneficiary. That is a 40-percent increase. Let us try again, Mr. Speaker.

The average spending per Medicare beneficiary today is \$4,800. Under the Republican plan, Medicare spending per beneficiary in the year 2002 will be \$6,700. Under this plan Medicare spending will increase by \$1,900.

Mr. Speaker, that is a 40-percent increase.

#### THE WACO TRAGEDY: THE TRUTH VERSUS DAVID KORESH'S DREAM TEAM

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned that the actions of the ATF and the FBI were inappropriate, to say the least, in that tragedy that occurred for everyone in Waco. Therefore, as one who is concerned about the ATF and the FBI action, I observed with great interest the congressional hearings that were held in the last Congress, and I have been an equally observant watcher of the congressional hearings about Waco in this Congress. I must say, the hearings this time have been politicized, and in my judgment, worse, are really an embarrassment to this House, and to the American people who seek to find out the truth.

The Republican majority on the committee are tragically acting like the defense for the Branch Davidians. They are appearing to be David Koresh's dream team. That is embarrassing. We need to get at the truth.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 201 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 201

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule, and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as pending. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. If that amendment is adopted,

the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule. Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. All points of order against amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived. During further consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to include extraneous material.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 201 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2099, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and

Urban Development, and various independent agencies for fiscal year 1996. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI—prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill—and also waives clause 6 of rule XXI—prohibiting reappropriations—against provisions of the bill.

The rule further provides that after general debate, this bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and the amendment printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as pending. That amendment shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendment shall not be subject to amendment and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. If the amendment is adopted, the provisions of the bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule. Further consideration of the bill for amendment shall proceed by title rather than by paragraph, and each title shall be considered as read.

The rule also makes in order the amendments printed in part 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules, and waives all points of order against these amendments. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition of Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to applaud subcommittee chairman, JERRY LEWIS, and ranking member, LOUIS STOKES, along with the rest of the members of the Appropriations Committee for a job well done. They've performed miracles in meeting the needs of our country's veterans as well as the housing requirements of the needy and the elderly. The bill also funds NASA and numerous other agencies, and I am especially pleased to see that almost \$2 billion has been allocated for the space station, which I strongly support.

But there is no higher priority, Mr. Speaker, than meeting the Federal Government's obligation to honor the commitment made to the veterans of this Nation. Whether it was during World War I, World War II, where I proudly served, or in Korea or Vietnam, or even during more recent military conflicts, over 27 million men and women risked their lives for the United States of America. We owe it to them to ensure that they have an adequate standard of living, and receive the medical care and other benefits they earned through their service to this country. The committee did an excellent job in making limited funds go a long way in order to live up to our obligations to our veterans, and I commend them for their dedication and hard work.

Mr. Speaker, this open rule will allow all Members to fully participate in the amendment process, and I urge its adoption. I include the following materials for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,<sup>1</sup> 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 25, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open <sup>2</sup>	46	44	39	73
Modified Closed <sup>3</sup>	49	47	12	23
Closed <sup>4</sup>	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	53	100

<sup>1</sup> This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

<sup>2</sup> An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

<sup>3</sup> A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

<sup>4</sup> A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 25, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271-151 (3/2/95).

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: 257-155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414-4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252-170 A: 255-168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233-176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225-191 A: 233-183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MillCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223-180 A: 245-155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-196 A: 236-191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221-178 A: 217-175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258-170 A: 271-152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236-194 A: 234-192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235-193 D: 192-238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230-194 A: 229-195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242-185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232-192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	A: voice vote (7/20/95)
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 217-202 (7/21/95)
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)
H. Res. 201 (7/25/95)	O	H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/25/95)

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

□ 1040

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this rule and the bill it makes in order, the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

This rule sanctions the most flagrant and wholesale violation in memory of the House rule that prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill. By protecting major legislative changes—policy changes—contained in this bill, it allows the Appropriations Committee to run roughshod over the authorizing committees.

If Democrats, when we were in the majority, had ever proposed a rule that protected by waivers so many major changes in substantive law, our Republican colleagues would have protested loudly and vehemently—and they would have been right. This rule ought to be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, up until today, we have generally accepted the need for waivers of rule XXI—the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill—which have been contained in the rules for consideration of appropriations bills this year. We recognize, from our years of being in the majority, that it is extremely difficult to avoid all violations of rule XXI in an appropriations bill.

There are almost always cases where it is necessary to include funds for programs or agencies that have not been reauthorized yet, or where it is necessary to provide some guidance to the agencies in the way moneys are spent. So we understand, and agree, that

there are often legitimate and appropriate reasons to waive rule XXI.

However, the waiver of rule XXI provided by this rule goes far beyond the bounds of what can reasonably be considered legitimate or appropriate. This waiver is being used to allow the Appropriations Committee to substantially rewrite major environmental and housing laws. It is being used to allow the Appropriations Committee to usurp the function of the authorizing committees, and to deny the House the opportunity to have a full debate on these policy changes. That, in our view, is an egregious misuse of the waiver.

The majority defends this waiver by saying that the authorizing committee chairmen agreed to the Appropriations Committee's inclusion of legislative language in areas under their jurisdiction, which follows a policy that was established when the Democratic party was in the majority of providing rule XXI waivers only in such cases.

However, that policy worked when we were in the majority because our party's authorizing committee chairmen did not agree to major revisions to laws under their jurisdiction in appropriations bill, as the current authorizing committee chairmen apparently do. These chairmen are evidently willing to cede their responsibilities to the Appropriations Committee, rather than defend the integrity of the legislative process by insisting on their committees' right to make major policy changes the way they should be made, through authorizing legislation.

We suspect that the reason they are agreeing to this intrusion on their committees' rightful role and obligation is because they realize that these policy revisions might not withstand the scrutiny of a full-scale debate, with

possible amendments, on the House floor.

To make matters worse, the rule denies rule XXI protection to amendments that would allow the House to debate these policy changes. It denies waivers for all but two amendments that Members sought protection for—amendments to be offered by Mr. KLUG of Wisconsin, and by Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. No amendments sought by Member from our side of the aisle received the protection they need in this rule.

During the Rules Committee consideration of this rule, our efforts to allow considering these amendments were rejected on a party line vote. As a result, the House will not have the opportunity to debate important amendments that were sought by Mr. STOKES of Ohio, the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, or Mrs. ROUKEMA of New Jersey.

We believe that if we are going to rewrite policy in appropriations bills then, in the interest of fairness, and of producing the best possible legislation, we ought to protect the amendments Members want to offer so that the House can have a full debate on these policy changes. That is particularly true if the House is faced with a bill, such as this one, that makes drastic policy changes that will significantly affect virtually all of our citizens.

Consider what this bill does to the environment: It slashes funds for environmental protection by 32 percent, providing one-third less than what we are currently spending. These cuts would cripple EPA's enforcement efforts, seriously weakening the implementation of virtually every major environmental law—including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe

Drinking Water Act, and the law regulating the use of pesticides. It would prohibit EPA from initiating cleanup at new Superfund sites.

In addition, 17 legislative provisions in the bill—language protected by this rule—would prohibit EPA from enforcing or implementing most Clean Water Act programs, including wetlands protection, new effluent discharge standards, new pretreatment standards, and new water quality standards; prohibit EPA regulatory actions with respect to many Clean Air Act rules; prohibit EPA actions on pesticides which had previously been allowed to be used on raw agricultural commodities; restrict the ability of EPA to issue rules concerning the emission of toxic substances from cement kilns and other industrial furnaces; prohibit EPA from implementing the Great Lakes Water Quality Program; prohibit EPA from taking actions against polluters whose violations are uncovered through state audits; and make numerous other changes that hamper the EPA's ability to protect the health and safety of our citizens.

When the funding cuts and legislative changes contained in this bill are combined with the changes to environmental policy that have been made in other bills the House has passed this year—including the Clean Water Act revision, and the so-called regulatory reform bills—this effort amounts to nothing less than a full-scale assault on the environmental protection laws that have served our Nation so well during the past three decades.

The other area that is cut drastically by this bill is housing, where funding is reduced by 25 percent from this year's level.

Here, too, the funding cuts and the legislative changes in the bill amount to significant changes in housing policy. Among other provisions, this bill would raise the rent ceiling for families living in public housing; suspend the existing preference system for public housing tenants; and suspend the one-for-one replacement rule for public housing. It would also prohibit HUD from issuing or enforcing a rule to apply the Fair Housing Act to the underwriting of property insurance, and make numerous other policy changes.

On top of all that, this bill also eliminates all funding for a number of current programs, including the AmeriCorps National Service Program, the Community Development Bank initiative, and the FDIC Affordable Housing Program. In addition, it provides for the termination of the Council of Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality within the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that reason that the bill cuts spending 13 percent below current levels is because the VA-HUD Subcommittee had a much smaller spending allocation to work with than in the past. However, I would point out that the subcommittee was in that position only because of the

misguided budget priorities that the Republican majority has imposed. Those priorities are forcing Congress to make deep cuts in domestic programs in order to pay for unnecessary increases in defense spending—including more weaponry than the Defense Department itself has requested—and tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, this is a truly bad rule—one that would trash our most important procedural safeguard, that protects the most egregious violation of legislating on an appropriations bill in memory—and that does so to allow the House to make damaging changes to environmental and housing laws with only minimal debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me point out that, yes, I am the chairman of the Committee on Rules, but before that I was the senior ranking Republican on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 10 years. I was very, very proud of that service.

I rise now somewhat concerned with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], who wants people to come over here and vote against this open rule. I just cannot believe what I am hearing. First of all, let us get the record straight once and for all. If you are listening back in your offices, Members, you had better listen up, because your political life is at stake here.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] wants you to come over here and vote against this rule. Behind the scenes, the reason they want this rule defeated is because they are concerned that there are cuts in such things as the Environmental Protection Agency, in housing, and a whole host of other things.

What they are not telling you is that we have spent days and days and days on something, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the former chairman and the ranking Democrat on that committee, myself, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and members of his committee. We have struggled for weeks to get adequate funding for the other part of this veterans and housing and independent agencies bill, and that is the veterans' medical care delivery system.

I want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], but let me digress just 1 more minute before I do that.

If Members come over here and vote against this rule, then this bill does

not come to the floor. And what happens? All of the issues are reopened. If you are going to increase funding for housing or the Environmental Protection Agency or all these other things, where do you think it is going to come from? It is going to come out of the only part of this bill that has an increase, and that is the veterans' portion of the budget. Think about that, ladies and gentleman. I want you to come over here and I dare you to vote against this rule.

Let us get back to the bill itself. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] came here with me 17 years ago. He has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I had an opportunity to serve on that committee when our good friend Jack Kemp stepped down and chose not to seek reelection. I did not do that because I liked the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I liked the Committee on Rules, where I thought I could be of some help.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has done an outstanding job. When we look at the budget that we had to vote for with its allocation to the 13 functional areas of Government, I guess perhaps the gentleman from California has had the toughest job of all in trying to make sure that this entire portion of the budget was treated fairly.

Let me tell you, they have treated it fairly. The Clinton administration had asked for an increase in the Veterans' Administration function, as they did with many other functions. As a matter of fact, they asked for so many increases that they would have increased the national debt by \$1 trillion over the next 5 years if we had allowed that.

But we did not, because we have a deeper responsibility, and that is to balance this budget over the next 7 years. To do that, you have to cut just about everything. You have to get this spending under control, this leviathan sea monster that is literally drowning this country in a sea of red ink. Members of this Congress have done it.

In this particular bill, we have been able to scrimp and save and put together almost \$300 million in additional spending over what was originally presented. In other words, we have adjusted the 602(b) allocation. That is inside-the-beltway talk, but what that means is, in other words, in the caps we have to live with, we have been able to in these last several weeks, after much negotiation, to raise that 602(b) allocation, the caps, by about \$300 million, with all of it going into the veterans' medical care delivery system.

In addition, we have been able to adjust other functions within the Veterans' Administration to make sure that we have got adequate funding, similar to what was asked for by Secretary Brown and President Bill Clinton, of almost \$480 million. That is about some 80 to 85 percent of what they were asking for.

In this particular bill, we have increases for the veterans' affairs and no increases for anything else.

I just want to say this. We are going to have amendments that are going to be offered on this floor today, and they are going to offer to cut other functions and put more money into the veterans' affairs functions. I am going to tell you this: That after all of the negotiations that we have gone through, that I am going to oppose any of those amendments that are going to try to cut other areas and put more money into veterans' affairs.

I have stood on this floor for 17 years as an advocate for the veterans, and I guess I have more plaques hanging on my wall than any other Member of this Congress, just about, for what we have tried to do for veterans. But I am going to tell you, the veterans that I represent know that we have done a good job, that it is adequately funded with the moneys that we have to work with this year.

I would just hope that every Member would not only come over here and vote for this rule, but that then they would support the gentleman from California's appropriation bill because it is an outstanding job that he has done. And I just commend the gentleman for it.

I will be here on this floor all day long. I will be glad to enter into a colloquy with anybody. I will be glad to go outside and enter into a colloquy and discuss what we have done. I think that the other Members who have worked so diligently with us to put this together will do the same thing.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief colloquy?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the pressures that the gentleman is under and the attitude with which he brings out this year's budget.

I would just point out to the gentleman that we would have about \$245 billion more to play with if we were not involved in an enormous tax cut for the richest people in this country and that we could address a lot more of the veterans' needs, of the needs of the homeless and many other people in this country, the kind of capabilities they need their Government to be providing them. After the veterans of this country have served us, it seems to me that to be cutting the taxes for the richest people in the Nation is a very irresponsible act that is being undertaken at this same time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I will be glad to continue with the gentleman on his time to say that the gentleman has a point, that there have been recommendations for tax cuts.

I personally think that a \$500 tax cut for individual families in this country is not too much to ask for. I do not think that a capital gains tax cut is too much to ask for.

I am going to be speaking in Hyde Park, NY, Saturday morning, whether there is a session here or not, before many, many senior citizens who have worked all their lives. They have saved and they have scrimped, they have a little stock involved and they have held onto that stock. Now they want to sell it, but they do not want the Government to confiscate all of their profit after holding that stock for 20 or 30 years. That to me is being compassionate, and that is what we are really doing.

The gentleman's points are well taken.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SOLOMON. Why do you not get your time, then I will be glad to answer your questions. We are running out of time over here.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer to spend the time debating this than anything else the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has to say.

Mr. SOLOMON. I have to retain my time and yield back my time. Come on over here and let us talk about it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. STOKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to associate myself with the excellent statement of Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that in my opinion, the bill we are discussing today is badly flawed. I had hoped to be able to offer amendments to improve this legislation somewhat, but under the unfair terms of this rule, I am restricted in the amendments I will be able to offer.

This rule demonstrates—in the clearest manner possible—the lack of respect the Republican majority has for the rules of the House of Representatives and for the rights of the minority. The rule waives points of order against nearly 30 pages of pure legislative language in the bill. That is right. More than one-third of the total bill is legislation that could be struck on points of order if not protected by this rule. I am not talking about technical violations. And I am not talking about waivers for lack of authorization. What I am referring to are changes in substantive law—pages and pages of it.

The rule also makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Republican bill manager. Although it makes 20 separate changes to the bill, this amendment is not subject to amendment or to a demand for a division. In addition, two other amendments requested by Republicans are protected by the rule from points or order. By way of contrast, not one of the nine amendments Democratic Members sought to have protected under the rule received protection.

When I testified before the Rules Committee earlier in the week, I asked that the legislative provisions in the bill not be protected. If that request could not be granted, I requested waivers of certain Democratic amendments so at a minimum the House could have a debate on the merits of these very important issues. That request for fairness was also rejected.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I refer to a memorandum sent from the chairman of the Rules Committee to the Republican leadership earlier this month. The following statement was made:

The more legislative policy debates that are injected into the appropriations process, beyond mere cutting amendments, the longer the amendment process on which bill will take. A greater effort could be made by the leadership to limit legislative provisions and amendments on appropriations bills in favor of debating and voting on these through the regular authorization process.

In my opinion, it is a grave mistake that the suggestion of the Rules Committee chairman was not followed on this bill. The debate on repealing the Brooke amendment or on repealing the Delaney amendment should be managed by the Legislative Committees after proper hearings and deliberation. It should not be accomplished on this appropriations bill.

I urge defeat of the rule.

□ 1100

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first want to express my very sincere appreciation to both the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], my colleague on the Committee on Rules, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], for their courtesy during our effort to put this bill together and to fashion a rule that allowed us to go forward with the work that we had to do here. I would like also to express my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for his very kind remarks regarding our effort on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we will have plenty of time today to discuss the substance of this bill, so I do not intend to put us through any of that at this moment, except to mention a couple of items that may not come up in the debate and reference a bit of the discussion relative to the language that exists within this bill.

Earlier in the year, during the rescissions process, the new majority made some effort to address what the House had done relating to spending during the 1995 fiscal year. It became very obvious to all of us that we were establishing spending priorities for the future of this country.

The effort is an attempt to reduce the rate of growth of spending across

the Government. There is little doubt that all of us recognize the need, progressively, to try to make sense out of what we are doing with our budget in terms of the national debt. Whether my colleagues are supportive of balancing the budget by 2002, as we propose, or they support the idea of balancing budget in a 10-year period as the President has proposed, clearly, we are going to have to address the question of reducing spending across all those elements of Government, especially where there is discretionary spending.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those bills with the largest pools of discretionary spending. There is not any doubt that because the appropriations process is moving ahead of the authorization process, that there are implications between policy direction and what we ought to be doing with spending. Because of that, we have been working very, very closely with all of our authorizing committees. We are working with approximately six different committees, working with their chairmen with members, Democrat and Republican alike, attempting to seek new direction from those policy committees.

That has led to the addition of a good deal of language in this bill, much of which has been protected. I am a Member of the House who has long said that the appropriations process should be as separate as possible from the policy work of the authorization committees, but this is a most unusual year.

Post "the revolution," our policy has implications relative to spending and the reverse is also true. So I want the House to know that while we have language in many instances that is designed to help us reduce spending, it is not the intention of this chairman to have the appropriations process become the authorization process in the years ahead. I would hope in the future that we will have very little language. But, indeed, the language in this bill is very important in terms of that overall effort to get a handle on the budget and move towards balancing the budget. We are at the same time, redirecting a long-established pattern of more spending every year by way of our appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one other subject area and that deals with the section of this bill that involves funding for NASA. Earlier in the year, we had no small amount of controversy swirl around the recommendations of this subcommittee that related to closing down some centers of NASA—three of them—and also to terminate one major program and delay a couple of others.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the Members how we came to that position, for it has had a very interesting impact upon our process. During the rescission work that I mentioned earlier, I had the opportunity to work with a number of my agencies. None was more cooperative than NASA. NASA stepped up to the plate and Ad-

ministrator Goldin was most helpful in helping us examine their priorities.

Because of this, NASA did quite well in the rescissions process. We attempted to have the same kind of communication during the 1996 appropriation process, and that began with meetings between myself and Administrator Goldin.

We thought we were on a perfect pathway to effective cooperation, and then I received a phone call from the Administrator and his staff that indicated that somewhere on high, above the Administrator's office, the word had come down from the administration that they did not want communication with our committee about those priorities.

They said, "Let the committee make its cuts itself." Essentially, they were saying, "Do not cooperate." I suggested to the Administrator, and the people at NASA, that their bill would come forward in much different form than it might otherwise have, because I felt there was a need to consider the impact of infrastructure upon costs. We should be willing to reexamine programs in place to see if they continue to work.

It was very important that we be able to consider elements like that as we evaluated NASA's future. Clearly, I knew that we were not going to close centers, but we did need to send a message, not just to NASA but especially a message to this administration, that we need their cooperation if these bills are going to make sense for the country. Democrats and Republicans, we need to work together. Indeed, I was very disappointed in the administration's lack of willingness to cooperate.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to be a very controversial bill, without any question, but it does put us on a pathway that indeed gives us a real shot at balancing our budget by 2002.

We treated each account as equitably as possible. VA medical care is a very important account and we have done very well in that connection. From there, the reductions in spending that are involved treat every other agency in an equitable fashion, one against the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill, in my judgment. I appreciate the Members' attention, I certainly appreciate their support, and I look forward to their vote for the bill.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an outrage. This rule is an outrage. It makes a mockery of every promise made by the Republican leadership to run an open and democratic House.

The bill contains page after page of far-reaching and devastating legislative changes that change basic housing policy of the past 20 or 25 years.

Whether it is the suspension of the Brooke amendment, which holds down rents for the poorest people in our society, or rent increases for families and senior citizens; the micromanagement of HUD administration; or the hamstringing of the Office of Fair Housing, the bill will create more homelessness and result in more abandonment of and disinvestment from our cities and sets of policies than we have considered in the Congress since I have served here.

Worst of all, Mr. Speaker, these changes are being made with absolutely no consideration of the authorizing committees. What we have here is a complete abandonment of the responsibility of people that come here to the Congress of the United States, are assigned to the authorizing committees, and then back off, never hold a hearing, never have an up-or-down vote on policies, and cede all of their authority to the Committee on Appropriations.

The appropriations, because they want to achieve not only a balanced budget but they want to provide a \$250 billion tax cut to the richest Americans, not to senior citizens as was described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, but to the richest people in this country. That is where those tax breaks are going and that is why these cuts are being made and they are made without ever anyone standing up and having a debate about it.

So what happens is the authorizing committee takes a powder. We have a bunch of brain-dead people around here; flatliners who are not even taking the fundamental responsibility of holding a hearing and asking the real questions about how we should be making our priorities.

So, it is ceded to the appropriators. The appropriators take that authority and they say, "Let us have at it." They make the chops wherever they want and have no idea what the impacts of these cuts are actually going to be the poorest and most vulnerable people in the society.

The Committee on Rules, which is supposed to allow any Member of this House the opportunity to come and offer an amendment on the floor of this Congress to be able to change what the appropriators have done, and they stifle every one of us.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrage. If we look at what they have done to this HUD administration, at what they are going to do to create homelessness in this country, the people that look at these issues will be outraged.

If my colleagues look at the fact that we saw in this bill \$5 billion cut overnight with the stroke of a pen, more homelessness will be created by the stroke of that pen than any policy in the history of this country.

We see 23 percent of the budget cut. We see things like the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], who tried to offer an amendment to put back the

Drug Elimination Program, a program I visited twice this week in my own district. That program is providing tenant action groups with the capability of eliminating drug dealers from public housing; stricken from this bill without so much as a minute of debate and not even an attempt to be able to have that debate on the floor of the Congress of the United States.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD], and I, have an alternative that would provide least-cost housing. Let us have your cost benefit analysis. Let us have it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, we will give it to him.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will give it to us?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me point out, this is an open rule. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been here quite a while and he knows what that means. First of all, this is an appropriation bill put on the floor under an open rule. Now, that means the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] or the gentleman from Massachusetts or any other Member are treated the same. Let me explain, because the gentleman needs to know this. It will ensure to his benefit. This is an open rule. I am going to show the gentleman how to do what he wants to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am listening.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can offer any germane amendment that he wants to under the rules of the House and under this rule.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not have that much time, but let me explain to the gentleman from New York the problem with what his premise is.

The problem is because the authorizing committee has never held a hearing, because we never passed a bill, which is way beyond my capacity because the chairman is now a Republican, none of these bills, none of these changes, the Drug Elimination Grant Program is not authorized, thus, it is subject to a point of order.

So the gentleman from New York can tell me that I can offer the amendment, but the first thing that happens is a Member pops up on the other side and say that I am out of order or the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is out of order because the program is not authorized.

The gentleman says it is an open rule; we can offer any amendment that we want. But the gentleman knows that hidden behind that are a series of procedural changes that the Republicans have offered time and time again that knock out our capability of offering and having a legitimate debate on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman, is that not true?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, no, it is not true.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, can I offer the Drug Elimination Grant Program?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has rights to offer limitation amendments, cutting amendments, and transfer amendments under the Rules of the House. The gentleman is trying to say that we are trying to prevent him from doing something, and I am telling the gentleman that he can do anything he wants to under the rules of the House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York knows that is not true. The gentleman knows those are not the rules that we are operating under.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The Chair cautions Members to refrain from using first names and should refer to Members in the third person.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I was listening very carefully to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules, just said. As the chairman knows, I came before the Committee on Rules in an attempt to get my amendment in order on this floor to have a full debate on the Drug Elimination Program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill eliminates the Drug Elimination Program, which I think is absolutely wrong for this country. It affects the town of the gentleman from New York, my town, every city and town in this country. I was denied the ability to bring that amendment up on the basis that this rule waived points of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get an answer to my question. I listened and the gentleman from New York said the rule provides that we can offer amendments to cut. My amendment is not a cutting amendment, Mr. Speaker, my amendment is an amendment to transfer money from FEMA to the Drug Elimination Program.

□ 1115

But I am not made in order on this floor. I would like the chairman, whom I have great respect for, to please explain to me whether under the rule I will be allowed an opportunity to have a full debate on that amendment as approved by the committee.

I have been told I cannot offer this amendment. I have a right to know that. He said I could offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry which the Chair can respond to. It is not the Chair's responsibility to interpret

pending special orders, but to interpret them once adopted at the appropriate time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Now, wait a minute. I am not sitting down. I have served in this Chamber for 13 years. I want to know from the Chair if the rule provides me the right to offer my amendment to restore the funds for the drug elimination program.

My amendment transfers those funds from FEMA, which is in the same bill, to the account at HUD for drug elimination.

I just heard the chairman say amendments in order are cutting amendments. My amendment is not a cutting amendment. It is a transfer amendment. I have a right to know the answer to that question.

There are lives at stake all over this country on this amendment. It is important for me to know the answer. That is, I would expect the Chair could answer that question for me, with all due respect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot answer the gentlewoman's question. It is not a parliamentary inquiry the Chair can answer. The Chair cannot interpret the intent of the rule while pending. It can only rule on the enforcement of that rule.

Ms. KAPTUR. But the Chair obviously knows what the rule is. Does the Chair not know?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in legitimate debate, but has not made a parliamentary inquiry the Chair can respond to.

Ms. KAPTUR. How about if I ask the Chair under what part of the rule could I bring up this amendment? It is my understanding that I am barred from bringing up this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is something that the gentlewoman can direct, if the manager of the time would yield you time for a question or a colloquy; the gentlewoman may do that. The Chair cannot rule on this as a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], would he yield and answer my question, please, sir?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield time?

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the time. I think she has been speaking on the rule rather than making a parliamentary inquiry, and I will be happy to yield her 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. QUILLEN. I am happy to yield the gentleman 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

It is my understanding that the amendment that I came before the committee to offer, which proposed

that we transfer \$290 million from FEMA to the drug elimination program in order to restore it because it was zeroed out in the committee, which I think is backward policy for this country, is not in order on this floor.

If the chairman could, please, explain to me, based on what you have just said on the floor, is my amendment now in order?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Let me say something to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], for whom I have a great deal of respect. I have served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with her for years. We have not done anything to prevent you from doing anything that is allowed under the rules of this House.

Now, we have allowed cutting amendments. We allow limitation amendments. And we allow—

Ms. KAPTUR. Mine is not a cutting amendment, sir.

Mr. SOLOMON. You did not let me finish. Just a moment. We allow cutting amendments. We allow limiting amendments, saying none of these funds can be used for this purpose. We allow transfer amendments. If your amendment is in order under the rules of the House, you can offer it.

My suggestion is that you go to the Parliamentarian and let him advise you as to whether or not your amendment is in order.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I understand my colleague's question and concern.

Her amendment is a very special category for, as you may recall in the rescissions process, we eliminated the money for this program. As a result of that, there is nothing in the bill to transfer moneys to, and above and beyond that the program is not authorized by the authorizing committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate and I have great respect for the chairman.

This is exactly where the rules process fails us, simply because the program has been operating since 1988, but because the House in committee has not acted, that program is not authorized. Therefore, if I try to offer this amendment, even though it is operating, I will be called on a point of order on the floor, Mr. Speaker. This is why I came before the committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If I could say to the gentlewoman, this program has existed for some time. The people in charge of the authorizing committee during that time chose, for one reason or another, not to reauthorize it. As a result of that and because there is no money in the bill, it does not qualify

under the rules of the House. It has nothing to do with this rule. It has to do with the rules of the House. I am sorry to say that. That is the reality we are dealing with.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, you know, I feel sorry that the committee cannot conduct its business, but simply because that committee, under its so-called new leadership, cannot conduct its business, they have no right to eliminate these drug elimination programs around this country which are so successful.

It would seem to me the Republican leadership of this House could find a way for me to offer this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I must say, indeed, the new leadership has had 3 months to consider these problems. They have not been able to change the world yet, but the gentlewoman should know we are working on it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], the distinguished ranking member.

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. H.R. 2099 is a bad bill, and since the rule protects that bill, this is a bad rule and should be defeated.

H.R. 2099 is replete with legislative provisions, funding restrictions and riders which go to the very heart of our Nation's environmental protection. The bill eliminates EPA's role in the wetlands program, it prohibits EPA from addressing stormwater pollution, it stops EPA from assuring the control of raw sewage through combined sewers and sanitary sewers, it halts all advancement in controlling industrial pollution, it prohibits efforts to clean up the Great Lakes, and it denies badly needed funding to our cities and States.

The result will be less environmental protection and increased risk to the health and safety of our constituents. This appropriations bill will single-handedly cause a major rollback of the protections of the Clean Water Act, Superfund, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

What does the rule do about the underlying bill? It waives all points of order against the legislative provisions, funding restrictions and riders which gut environmental protection. This is a clear abuse of the legislative process, and an affront to the citizens and communities we represent.

The people of this country are calling for responsive, responsible legislation. Yet, this rule protects provisions in H.R. 2099 which are totally irresponsible. H.R. 2099 rolls back environmental protection and denies financial assistance to communities, all in a misguided effort to pressure the Senate into gutting environmental laws.

My colleagues, this is not some game of legislative poker. We should not be playing fast and loose with the health

and safety of our constituents. We should not be denying desperately needed funding to States and cities to create leverage in securing waivers, loopholes and rollbacks which benefit industry's bottom line, but which cause harm to the general population.

H.R. 2099 is a bad bill, and this is a bad rule. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to just correct some of the misperception that I think was left on this floor with respect to the authorization.

I chair the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. Of course, as most people realize, for the first time in 40 years, the Republicans have the ability to chair and control the agenda on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and the subcommittees, including the subcommittee that I chair.

For the last 7 years, there has been an opportunity certainly to authorize the drug elimination program, and despite the fact that the opposition party, the Democratic Party, controlled both the House and the Senate for every one of those 7 years, there is a failure to reauthorize.

To suggest now that the new majority, who has been in control of that subcommittee for just a few months, is somehow responsible for not reauthorizing the program when they have had control for 40 years both on the House side, most of those 40 years on the Senate side, is a farce.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, this bill, and this process. In my tenure here in Congress, this is among the most heartless legislation I have seen.

To begin with, the Appropriations Committee has vastly exceeded its legislative authority in this bill. This bill legislates across the board. It infringes on the Banking Committee's authority by legislating in the area of housing. It enters the Commerce Committee's jurisdiction by legislating with respect to the environment. It is bad enough that the actual appropriations figures contained in this bill represent a virtual abandonment of this country's poor and moderate-income families. But the overt encroachment into authorization committee territory compounds this disaster.

I do not understand. We had a bipartisan effort with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] and myself where we did rent reform that encourages people to work so that when they go to work their earnings are not taken up by the housing authorities

and public housing charging them more rent, encouraging people to work. That is done away with.

Mr. Speaker, this bill raises rents on poor people—it prohibits HUD from enforcing the Fair Housing Act with respect to property insurance. It prohibits HUD from implementing the final RESPA rules.

This bill targets its deepest cuts at vulnerable populations—the poorest residents in public and assisted housing, the homeless, the poor, working families, and the elderly.

These cuts are unwise, unworkable, and unfair. We should reject this rule and bring up an entirely new bill. I urge a “no” vote on this rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding me time, although I did not get an answer to my question. I thank you for your gentlemanly comportment and also to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], our very capable Chair, who fully understands that I am barred under this rule from offering my amendment on the floor, and to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], I will not be allowed to offer this amendment to continue the drug eradication programs in our public housing neighborhoods around this country, because I will be called on a point of order.

It is not an open rule, because the Committee on Banking and Financial Services did not complete its business, sir, and I only have a minute and three-quarters under the rule.

So if you would be kind enough, I would just like to say every mayor in this country, every citizen in this country, every person who lives in and around public housing understands what it is like to have these projects controlled by snipers and drug lords. I was in Chicago; you could not even walk from building to building, because there were snipers on the roofs who were controlling the drug trade.

When I am not allowed to offer my amendment, what it means is that this Congress is going on record as saying that hundreds and hundreds of communities across this country can go it alone.

□ 1130

I think it is absolutely wrong for us to return our backs on the scourge of the drug trade that is eating away at the hearts of our communities, and I think it is absolutely wrong, I think it is wrong from a public policy standpoint. I think it is politically wrong for me to be denied the ability to offer this amendment on a program that has worked from the time that Jack Kemp started it in 1988. The city of Albany will be affected. The city of Los Angeles will be affected. Every single major community and minor community in

this country will be affected, and I think it is absolutely unfair, unfair that we are denied the opportunity to offer the amendment and the money. The proof in the pudding is the money that is used for this program. Rather than being spent on drug elimination, it is going to be bankrolled into a little account over in the Committee on Ways and Means to give tax breaks to the privileged few in this country. It is absolutely wrong.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remark that I, too, have been in Chicago, I, too, have visited State Street, Cabrini-Green. I have seen the distress in that community. I want to assure the gentlewoman that there will be other vehicles which use the same concept, the drug elimination, including CDBG, which is fully funded in this bill, as well as modernization funds which will be, by virtue of some new language that is offered, will be able to be fungible, be able to be used.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAZIO of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentleman that the funds in the bill at HUD have been cut by nearly 25 percent. Every mayor, including my own mayors in my district, and I represent several of them, do not have the luxury of being able to use money for this because they are so stressed out in the other accounts, sir. My colleague is going to make a lot of seniors pay more on their section 8 in their housing projects—

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I do want to re-emphasize again the Community Development Block Grant Program, which is a very large program, is fully funded in this bill, fully funded, and that is well more than most other programs authorized all throughout the rest of this bill.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to a rule that is unfair, obviously, in its application. One-third of this bill before us is made up of legislative language, and then we have the sponsors and advocates of this rule suggesting that we are only going to play by the rules; that is, the rules they make. In other words, they protect their policy advances and from any type of debate, any application from being stricken in terms of points of order, but will not permit the long-term programs, programs that have a proven track record, to even be considered on this floor because of their application of technical points. That is what is going on here.

But I think the effect of this is, as my colleagues know, we can wrap this in the virtue of deficit reduction and the new majority. The fact is we all know that authorization bills sometimes fall short.

But I am not concerned about it because of myself. I am concerned because of people I represent, because poor people, because working families that I represent in my district, are going to be hurt by this particular program and legislation, those that are trying to strive to pull themselves up by their bootstraps, that are living in public housing, in assisted housing, that need some guidance for their kids in terms of drug programs. They need to have hope.

As my colleagues knows, former Secretary Kemp, when he was Secretary, at least favored housing. Since then, of course, I think that that has changed a little bit, but the fact is he favored it, and he had programs called HOPE, and what my colleagues are doing is taking hope away from people, increasing the number of people and families that are vulnerable in our urban centers, in our rural areas, where they need help with housing.

Look at what is happening in this country in terms of the working families that are getting less income, they have less ability to afford housing. We have more of them families that are vulnerable. They do not have the resources, and the fact is of course this bill, what we have done, and why I wrote a homeless program in the 1980's, and I thank my colleagues for supporting it then; even those funds are cut in this program by 50 percent. We had to write that program because there are 600,000 people on the street. In other words, we are failing in terms of the policies we have, for housing both as Democrats and Republicans, and the people I represent are going to be hurt by this further reduction of HUD.

I say to my colleagues, “You cut modernization funds, Representative LAZIO, and the fact is that the authorizing committee just didn't fail to get the bill through the House. We really didn't even initiate the process in the last 6 months. I certainly understand that we have new leadership here, a new majority but we have got to have elemental fairness, we've got to look at what the impact is, and above all we should support and protect the vulnerable in this society, the working families that are trying to make it.”

This rule deserves to be defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, and it is a bad bill. Talk about an opportunity to dishonor our commitment to veterans, to environmental programs, to housing. This is the bill to do it. Talk about raising

havoc with jurisdictions in the House. I have served on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, all the environmental laws that for years that great committee worked to achieve on Superfund, on toxic pollution. Because of the gutting of some of the safeguards in this bill, who knows if we can recuperate?

Mr. Speaker, what we have here is a bill that for veterans this rule is going to mean 22,000 fewer veterans in this country will have hospital visits, and 500,000 fewer people will receive outpatient treatments. Again, for the environment this rule will mean cuts of \$500 million for the safe drinking water State revolving fund and \$500 million for the clean water State revolving fund. Why have a Clean Water Act? Why have a Safe Drinking Water Act?

What we have also is legislation that means that over 1,000 native-American families will not have a home to live in this year, and, if this is not bad enough, this rule also supports legislation that slashes funding for housing, for persons with AIDS, the elderly, and the disabled by 46 percent.

Mr. Speaker, AmeriCorps, the President's national service program, goes by the wayside in this bill. The Council on Environmental Quality, the enforcers, the watchdog of a lot of the Federal pollution issues in environment within the bureaucracy: slashed.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is an opportunity to defeat this rule and allow amendments, and let us face it. There are no Democratic amendments allowed to protect legislation that is important and to change the direction of this bill. Every authorizing committee should rise up against this legislation.

If you want to vote for a rule that destroys our commitments to veterans, housing, and environmental programs—this is it.

For veterans this rule will mean 22,000 fewer people will have hospital visits and 500,000 fewer people will receive outpatient treatments.

For the environment this rule will mean cuts of \$500 million for the safe drinking water State revolving fund and \$500 million for the clean water State revolving fund.

Passage of this rule means we will consider a bill that cuts assistance for homeless programs by 50 percent.

Supporting this rule means over 1,000 native-American families will not have a home to live in this year.

And as if that's not bad enough, this rule also supports legislation that slashes funding for housing for persons with AIDS, the elderly and the disabled by 46 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we are playing politics with people's lives. Attacking the deficit should not be partisan and mean, but that's exactly what the bill we're about to consider is.

I urge my colleagues to stop this cruel trick on the American people by defeating this rule.

This rule protects a lot of bad legislation in an appropriations bill and denies every single Democratic amendment to change that legislation.

Democrats are opposed to this Republican assault on housing and environmental programs that Republicans refuse to give us a chance to fix.

This bill weakens environmental laws, destroys housing programs, and raises rents on the elderly all to pay for a Republican tax break for the very rich.

Housing cuts to pay for tax breaks: The provisions in this bill will lead to rent increases for the elderly and the poor all to pay for a Republican tax break for the richest people in this country.

Gutting environmental laws for tax breaks: This Republican attack on American families guts Federal safeguards that protect our air, water, land, and public health from toxic pollution—it also cuts Superfund by more than \$500 million and cuts State revolving funds for clean water and safe drinking water by more than \$1 billion below the President's request.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, we yield our final 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy discussing rules and praising and saluting my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], one of the finest and most able men up here. He presides over his committee with extraordinary grace and dignity. It is always a privilege for me to appear before him. He has, however, presented to the House a bad rule. It is a bad rule on a bad bill, and it enhances his reputation as "Closed Rule SOLOMON."

What has he done? He slashes, the bill slashes, EPA funding. It is crammed full of legislative riders that are designed to eviscerate the environmental statutes that currently protect our lands, our waters, and air.

It is also interesting to note that these legislative riders which eviscerate the environmental laws are protected by points of order. As I stated in my testimony before the Committee on Rules, I strongly object to a rollback in the Nation's environmental protections without public debate and without concurrence of the legislative committees.

My good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], announced that he had had the concurrence of the legislative committees. I know of no concurrence that was given by our Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Nor do I know of any concurrence given by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. Now, while I do not dispute those words, the complete lack of even a minute of discussion of waivers provided by this rule of any authorizing committee leads me to question the process. It is at best curious, it is certainly outrageous, and it is very clearly anti-environment and anti-the-public interests. The rule allows dramatic changes in the environmental laws of the United States using the back door of an appropriations bill, something which is prohibited in the rules unless waived by the Committee on Rules. There has been little or no public discussion of better than two dozen riders that are attached. Some

totally stop implementation and enforcement of the Clean Water Act. Others create unprecedented new privileges allowing States to shield companies from Federal enforcement actions and from criminal prosecution. Image that. Others arbitrarily create special exemptions from various provisions for oil and gas industries. Not only do these change policy, but they do it in a manner which is, frankly, incompetent and sloppy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the colloquy on the floor on the rule itself has been to ignore the veterans of this country. They have picked out items in HUD and others as primary. Let us not forget that this is a VA appropriation bill along with the problems that HUD has experienced over the years, along with the other independent agencies. Single out one thing, if my colleagues must, but do not forget that we are here to consider the whole picture. Look at the forest, not just a tree.

So I urge the Members of this body to support this rule, and support the bill, and support the veterans of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, to close the debate I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a very valuable member of the House Committee on Rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 6 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman emeritus of the Committee on Rules, my friend from Kingsport, TN, for yielding this time to me, and I rise in very strong support of this rule. I have been listening for the last few minutes to the statements which have been coming from our friends on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and others who are in some way implying that this is less than an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], has made it very clear this is an open rule. Any of these Members, any of these Members who are complaining about this process, have an opportunity to offer striking amendments. They can do that under the open amendment process.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I look forward to his remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague can the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] offer her amendment to put money back into the drug elimination program?

Mr. DREIER. What I said, if I can reclaim my time, what I said is under an open amendment process we are all allowed the chance to offer striking amendments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. She has a striking amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Yes, to transfer money into a program that does not even exist.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The program most certainly does exist—

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time—if I could reclaim my time, we had a very healthy exchange that took place between the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee that deals with this issue, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], and it seems to me that there needs to be recognition that an opportunity to deal with this is on the horizon.

Now my friend has raised the issue which I was not even going to talk about in my remarks, but let us look at the issue of drugs as it has existed over the past several years, and, as has been pointed out time and time again, we have seen during the Reagan and Bush administrations a decline in drug use in this country, but since we have seen the election of President Clinton there has been an increase in drug use in this country.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. If I can continue to hold onto the time—

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am just asking the gentleman to yield.

Mr. DREIER. Let me just say that we have seen that increase. We are working to deal with the issue of authorization. We are trying to deal with this question head-on.

□ 1145

But the fact of the matter is, there have been tremendous chances for Members of the formerly-in-the-majority-party to deal with this issue through authorization, and it has not been dealt with. So in any way to claim the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is denied her opportunity to offer striking language is way off base.

Let me just say I want to compliment the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for the superb job he has done in dealing with the veterans, as the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. QUILLEN, has raised this, and I know the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, has, and also with an issue that is very important to me, and that happens to be the science question. I believe as we charge towards the millennium, we have to recognize our responsibility in further research and development in the area of the sciences.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has done a superb job in dealing with that. This is an open rule. It is one that deserves the support of the full membership in a bipartisan way. We complained on our side of the aisle in the past when we did not have an open amendment process. Frankly, we

have brought that forward. We hope very much we can move ahead with this extremely important piece of legislation.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 189, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

YEAS—230

Allard	Ehrlich	Knollenberg
Archer	Emerson	Kolbe
Armey	English	LaHood
Bachus	Ensign	Largent
Baker (CA)	Everett	Latham
Baker (LA)	Ewing	LaTourrette
Ballenger	Fawell	Laughlin
Barr	Fields (TX)	Lazio
Barrett (NE)	Flanagan	Leach
Bartlett	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Barton	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bass	Fowler	Lightfoot
Bereuter	Fox	Linder
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Livingston
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Bliley	Frelinghuysen	Longley
Blute	Frisa	Lucas
Boehkert	Funderburk	Manzullo
Boehner	Gallegly	Martini
Bonilla	Ganske	McCollum
Bono	Gekas	McCrery
Brownback	Gilchrest	McHugh
Bryant (TN)	Gillmor	McInnis
Bunn	Gilman	McIntosh
Bunning	Goodlatte	McKeon
Burr	Goodling	Metcalf
Burton	Goss	Mica
Buyer	Graham	Miller (FL)
Callahan	Greenwood	Molinari
Calvert	Gunderson	Moorhead
Camp	Gutknecht	Morella
Canady	Hancock	Myers
Chabot	Hansen	Myrick
Chambliss	Hastert	Nethercutt
Chapman	Hastings (WA)	Neumann
Chenoweth	Hayes	Ney
Christensen	Hayworth	Norwood
Chrysler	Hefley	Nussle
Clinger	Heineman	Oxley
Coble	Herger	Packard
Coburn	Hilleary	Parker
Collins (GA)	Hobson	Paxon
Combest	Hoekstra	Petri
Cooley	Hoke	Pombo
Cox	Horn	Porter
Crane	Hostettler	Portman
Crapo	Houghton	Pryce
Creameans	Hutchinson	Quillen
Cubin	Hyde	Quinn
Cunningham	Inglis	Radanovich
Davis	Istook	Ramstad
Deal	Jacobs	Regula
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Roberts
Dickey	Jones	Rogers
Doolittle	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Dornan	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Kim	Roth
Duncan	King	Roukema
Dunn	Kingston	Royce
Ehlers	Klug	Salmon

Sanford	Solomon	Walker
Saxton	Souder	Walsh
Scarborough	Spence	Wamp
Schaefer	Stearns	Watts (OK)
Schiff	Stockman	Weldon (FL)
Seastrand	Stump	Weldon (PA)
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Weller
Shadegg	Tate	White
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Shays	Thomas	Wicker
Shuster	Thornberry	Wolf
Skeen	Tiahrt	Young (AK)
Smith (MI)	Torkildsen	Young (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Upton	Zeliff
Smith (TX)	Vucanovich	Zimmer
Smith (WA)	Waldholtz	

NAYS—189

Ackerman	Geren	Ortiz
Andrews	Gibbons	Orton
Baesler	Gonzalez	Owens
Baldacci	Gordon	Pallone
Barcia	Green	Pastor
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Payne (NJ)
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Payne (VA)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Pelosi
Bentsen	Harman	Peterson (FL)
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Bevill	Hefner	Pickett
Bishop	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Bonior	Holden	Poshard
Borski	Hoyer	Rahall
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Browder	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Kaptur	Rose
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Clay	Kennelly	Sabo
Clayton	Kildee	Sanders
Clement	Klecza	Sawyer
Clyburn	Klink	Schroeder
Coleman	LaFalce	Schumer
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Scott
Condit	Levin	Serrano
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Costello	Lincoln	Skaggs
Coyne	Lipinski	Skelton
Cramer	Lofgren	Slaughter
Danner	Lowey	Spratt
de la Garza	Luther	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney	Stenholm
DeLauro	Manton	Stokes
Dellums	Markey	Studds
Deutsch	Martinez	Stupak
Dicks	Mascara	Tanner
Dingell	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	McCarthy	Tejeda
Doggett	McDermott	Thompson
Dooley	McHale	Thornton
Doyle	McKinney	Thurman
Durbin	McNulty	Torres
Edwards	Meehan	Torricelli
Engel	Meek	Traficant
Eshoo	Menendez	Tucker
Evans	Mfume	Velazquez
Farr	Miller (CA)	Vento
Fattah	Mineta	Visclosky
Fazio	Minge	Ward
Fields (LA)	Mink	Waters
Filner	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Flake	Montgomery	Waxman
Foglietta	Moran	Williams
Ford	Murtha	Wilson
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wise
Frost	Neal	Woolsey
Furse	Oberstar	Wyden
Gejdenson	Obey	Wynn
Gephardt	Olver	Yates

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1205

Mr. PETERSON of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WALKER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING MIDDLE EAST PEACE PROCESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments concerning the national emergency with respect to organizations that threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order No. 12947 of January 23, 1995. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. On January 23, 1995, I signed Executive Order No. 12947, "Prohibiting Transactions with Terrorists Who Threaten to Disrupt the Middle East Peace Process" (the "order") (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5079, January 25, 1995). The order blocks all property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of 12 terrorist organizations that threaten the Middle East peace process as identified in an Annex to the order. The order also blocks the property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction of persons designated by the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, who are found (1) to have committed, or to pose a significant risk of committing, acts of violence that have the purpose or effect of disrupting the Middle East peace process, or (2) to assist in, sponsor, or provide financial, material, or technological support for, or services in support of, such acts of violence. In addition, the order blocks all property and interests in property subject to U.S. jurisdiction in which there is any interest of persons determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to be owned or controlled by, or to act for or on behalf of, any other person designated pursuant to the order (collectively "Specially Designated Terrorists" of "SDTs").

The order further prohibits any transaction or dealing by a United States person or within the United States in property or interests in property of SDTs, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or services to or for the benefit of such persons. This prohibition in-

cludes donations that are intended to relieve human suffering.

Designations of persons blocked pursuant to the order are effective upon the date of determination by the Secretary of State or his delegate, or the Director of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (FAC) acting under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Public notice of blocking is effective upon the date of filing with the *Federal Register*, or upon prior actual notice.

2. On January 25, 1995, FAC issued a notice listing persons blocked pursuant to Executive Order No. 12947 who have been designated by the President as terrorist organizations threatening the Middle East peace process or who have been found to be owned or controlled by, or to be acting for or on behalf of, these terrorist organizations (60 *Fed. Reg.* 5084, January 25, 1995). The notice identifies 31 entities that act for or on behalf of the 12 Middle East terrorist organizations listed in the Annex to Executive Order No. 12947, as well as 18 individuals who are leaders or representatives of these groups. In addition the notice provides 9 name variations or pseudonyms used by the 18 individuals identified. The FAC, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, will continue to expand the list of terrorist organizations as additional information is developed. A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

3. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 23 through July 21, 1995, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of the national emergency with respect to organizations that disrupt the Middle East peace process are estimated at approximately \$55,000. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Justice.

4. Executive Order No. 12947 provides this Administration with a new tool for combating fundraising in this country on behalf of organizations that use terror to undermine the Middle East peace process. The order makes it harder for such groups to finance these criminal activities by cutting off their access to sources of support in the United States and to U.S. financial facilities. It is also intended to reach charitable contributions to designated organizations to preclude diversion of such donations to terrorist activities.

In addition, I have sent to the Congress new comprehensive counter-terrorism legislation that would strengthen our ability to prevent terrorist acts, identify those who carry them out, and bring them to justice. The combination of Executive Order No. 12947 and the proposed legislation demonstrate the United States' determination to confront and combat those who would

seek to destroy the Middle East peace process, and our commitment to the global fight against terrorism.

I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against extremists seeking to destroy the hopes of peaceful coexistence between Arabs and Israelis as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 27, 1995.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday, due to illness, and missed rollcall votes No. 572 through 585. I would like the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

I would vote "no" on rollcall vote 585; "yes" on rollcall 584; "no" on rollcall 583; "yes" on rollcall 582; "no" on rollcall 581; "no" on rollcall 580; "yes" on rollcall 579; "yes" on rollcall 578; "no" on rollcall 577; "no" on rollcall 575; "no" on rollcall 574; "no" on rollcall 573; and "no" on rollcall 572.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. BEILENSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership has been consulted and has no objection to this request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.